SHRI CHINTA MOHAN: We will again write to them and try to elicit information.

Closing down of sick public sector undertakings

*102. SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR:†
SHRI RAM NARESH YADAV:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have conducted a detailed survey of their Public Sector Undertakings which are inefficient and loss making;

(b) if so, the details of the Public Sector Undertakings which have been found chronically sick and unlikely to be turned around and referred to the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction or other such high level institutions for revival/rehabilitation;

(c) what is the latest position of these Undertakings;

(d) how Government propose to rehabilitate the workers who would be affected by the closures; and

(e) whether the State Governments have been advised to conduct similar survey in respect of their Public Sector Undertakings, if so, the details thereof?

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P .K. THUNGON): (a) to (e) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Based on the performance of Central Public Sector Enterprises upto the year 1989-90 and also based on the definition of sickness given in the sick Industrial Companies (Special, Provisions) Act, 1985, 50 Central Public Sector Enterprises would be considered as chronically sick and referred to the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstuction after amending existing provisions of the said Act for revival or rehabilitation. A statement indicating the names of such enterprises is given in the annexure attached herewith.

(c) There is no change in the status of these enterprises.

(d) Government have already announced setting up of a National Renewal Fund to rehabilitate the workers who would be affected by the closures, if any.

(e) No, Sir. Various State Governments have been conducting surveys in respect of their public sector enterprises on their own.

Annexure

List of Chronically sick Public sector undertakings

S. No.	Name of the Cogn te Group/Public Sector Undertaking
1	2
	STEEL
1	Indian Iron & Ste l Co. Ltd.
	MINERAL AND METALS
2	Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.
	FERTILIZERS
3	Fertilizer Corpn. of India Ltd,
4	Hindustan Fertilizer Corpn. Ltd,

1	2
	CHEMICALS AND PHARMACEUTICALS
5	Bengal Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
6	Bengal Immunity Ltd.
7	Hindustan Fluorocarbons Ltd.
8	Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
9	Maharashtra Antibiotics & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
10	Orissa Drugs & Chemicals Ltd.
11	Smith Stanistreet & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
12	Southern Pesticides Corporation Ltd.
	HEAVY ENGINEERING
13	Bharat Process & Mechanical Engineers Ltd.
14	Braithwaite & Co. Ltd.
15	Burn Standard Company Ltd.
16	Mining & Allied Machinery Corpn. Ltd.
17	Triveni Structurals Ltd.
18	Weighbird (India) Ltd.
	MEDIUM AND LIGHT ENGINEERING
19	Bharat Brakes & Valves Ltd.
20	Bharat Pumps & Compressors Ltd.
21	Blecco Lawrie Ltd.
22	National Instruments Ltd.
23	Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd.
24	Vignyan Industries Ltd.
	TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT
25	Cochin Shipyard Ltd.
26	Cycle Corporation of India Ltd.
27	Hindustan Shipyard Ltd.
28	Hooghly Dock and Port Engineers Ltd.
29	National Bicycle Corporation of India Ltd.
30	Scooters India Ltd.
	CONSUMER GOODS
31	Bharat Ophthalmic Glass Ltd.
32	Birds, Jute & Exports Ltd.
33	Hooghly Printing Company Ltd.

1	2
34	Madhya National Paper Mills Ltd.
35	Nagaland Pulp & Paper Mills Ltd.
36	National Jute Manufacturers Corporation Ltd.
37	Rehabilitation Industries Corpn. Ltd.
38	Tannery & Footwear Corpn. of India Ltd.
39	Tyre Corporation of India Ltd.
	TEXTILES
40	British India Corporation Ltd.
41	Cawnpore Textiles Ltd.
42	Elgin Mills Company Ltd.
43	NTC (A. Pradesh Karnataka Kerala & Mahe) Ltd.
44	NTC (Delhi Punjab & Rajasthan) Ltd.
45	NTC (Gujarat) Ltd.
46	NTC (Madhya Pradesh) Ltd.
47	NTC (Maharashtra North) Ltd.
48	NTC (South Maharashtra) Ltd.
49	NTC (Uttar Pradesh) Ltd.
50	NTC (West Bengal Assam Bihar & Orissa) Ltd.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : महोदय, मंत्री महोदय के जवाब में और जो कुछ सरकार अब तक कहती रही है, उसमें विरोधाभास दिखता है। सरकार का यह कहना है कि हम बीमार कारखानों को न तो व्यक्तिगत लोगों के हाथ में देंगे अर्थात् प्राइवेटाइज नहीं करेंगे और न ही बंद करेंगे। लेकिन साथ ही मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि 50 सरकारी उपक्रमों को बी.आई.एफ.आर. को रेफर कर दिया जाएगा। तो इसका मतलब यह है कि या तो उनको बंद करने के लिए या प्राइवेटाइज करने के लिए रेफर किया जाएगा। तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि इन दोनों बातों का मेल कहां है?

मैं यह भी पूछना चाहूंगा कि बी.आई०एफ०आर० को सौंपने से पहले क्या कोई त्रिपक्षीय कमेटी बनाएंगे जिसमें कारखानों के प्रतिनिधि हों, सरकार के प्रतिनिधि हों और मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि हों और उसको इन कारखानों के कामकाज की जांच का काम सौंपेंगे? पहले आपकी एक ऐसी कमेटी बनी थी लेकिन आपने उसे भंग कर दिया। उसमें तीनों पक्षों के लोग बैठते थे और कारखाने के प्रबंध को देखते थे। क्या ऐसी कोई कमेटी बनाकर इन उपक्रमों को उसे रेफर किया जाएगा? आप जो यह कहते हैं कि हम प्राइवेटाइज नहीं करेंगे, बंद नहीं करेंगे, इनका मेल कैसे बैठेगा?

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: Sir, I would like to make it very clear, and the hon. Prime Minister has also made it amply clear, that we do not want to go against the interest of the workers. I would like to reiterate that there are no two different opinions in this as the hon. Member has stated that we were saying something on the one hand and we were doing something on the other. There is no dual policy. I would like to make it very clear that what we intend we

have already explained in the industrial policy. What we intend to do or our purpose is to revive and revitalise the sick units. At the same time, unless we go through it in great detail, we cannot come to a decision overnight. Therefore, an expert committee is appointed to go through it and see how the revival and rehabilitation can be done. That is why it has to be referred to an expert body, that is, BIFR.

So far as the second part of the question is concerned, our Government has already set up a very high-powered tripartite committee of which the Chairman is Mr. Sangma, the Labour Minister and that is our spirit. What the hon. Member has mentioned is that there should be consultations and we should try to evolve a consensus on how to deal with this national problem of sickness of industries. That is why the Government has already formed this tripartite committee.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : महोदय, मैं दूसरा सवाल पूछूंगा लेकिन मेरे पहले सवाल का जवाब नहीं आया। ये इन सरकारी उपक्रमों को बी०आई०एफ० आर० को रेफर कर रहे हैं। मैंने सवाल किया था कि क्या ये बी०आई०एफ०आर० को रेफर करने से पहले इनको विपक्षीय कमेटी के हवाले करेंगे? उस कमेटी में मजदूरों का प्रतिनिधि होगा या नहीं होगा? मैं पहले इसका स्पष्टीकरण चाहूंगा।

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: I have already stated that at the apex level we have formed a tripartite committee also.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय के जवाब से संतुष्ट नहीं हूं। रिहैबिलिटेट करने के लिए एक फंड बना दिया गया है। इससे साफ है कि उन सरकारी उपक्रमों को बंद करना है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस फंड के लिए आपको वर्ल्ड बैंक से कितना पैसा मिला है? अखबारों में यह आ रहा है कि इसके लिए वर्ल्ड बैंक आपको पैसा देने के लिए तैयार है। तो क्या आपने वर्ल्ड बैंक से पैसा लेना स्वीकार किया है और यदि किया है तो किन कंडीशंस पर किया है और अगर नहीं किया है तो क्या यह विचाराधीन है।

गवर्नमेंट यह भी कहती रही है कि जो ऐसी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनके बीस शेयर आप बेचेंगे। तो किनको बेचेंगे? क्या म्यूचुअल फंड को देंगे या विदेशी कंपनियों को देंगे?

श्री कमल मोरारका : घाटे वाले शेयर कौन खरीदेगा?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : ऐसा नहीं है। म्यूचुअल फंड वाले घाटे वाले शेयर खरीद सकते हैं। पैसा इस जेब से उस जेब में आएगा।

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: His point is not clear...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : वर्ल्ड बैंक का पैसा कितना है और क्या कंडीशंस हैं, यह बताइये। दूसरे क्या आप प्रियोरिटी देंगे म्युचल फंड वालों को इनके शेयर खरीदने के लिए?

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: As far as the first part of his question is concerned, I think the Finance Minister would be able to reply....

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: How is it? यह कहते हैं कि हम फंड बना रहे हैं तो यह फंड कैसे बनेगा? पैसा यह जमा कर रहे हैं। फंड कैसे रेज होगा?

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: I would like to explain the second part of the question. About disinvestment of public sector enterprises it has been stated in our policy that up to an extent of 20% equity will be disinvested so as to create a fund for revival of the industry....

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: The Minister is misleading the House. Mr. Minister, you are misleading the House.

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: You are not allowing me to complete. What can I do? I hope the honourable Members will have the patience to let me complete the sentence. I said that in order to revive the industry and to meet the Budget deficiency the Finance Minister had stated it in his Budget Speech. The apprehension of the honourable Member is that the public sector undertakings are going to be privatised. I would like to assure him that that is not so, we are not going to privatise the public sector undertakings... (*Interruption*)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : कोई जवाब क्यों नहीं आ रहा है?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Allow him to complete the answer. We will not be able to hear the Minister if you go on interrupting like this.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: At this rate we will not allow them to put questions.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : माननीय मंत्री जी ने उत्तर बहुत डिटेल में दिया है और इसमें 244 युनिट्स पब्लिक सेक्टर में हैं जिसमें 50 रुग्ण साबित हो चुकी हैं। इन कुल 244 युनिट्स में 22 लाख कर्मचारी हैं। बी०आई० एफ०आर० को सौंपने के अर्थ में तीन चीजें हो सकती हैं जैसा कि उत्तर में हैं। एक बात यह स्पष्ट हो सकती है कि सिक युनिट्स होने का मतलब वहां पर एम्पलायमेंट अधिक हो गया हो। यह भी एक चक्कर है। इसलिए इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इसमें कितने कर्मचारी लगे हुए हैं और उन कर्मचारियों में से कितनों की छटनी होने की संभावना है? क्योंकि चारों ओर यह आशंका फैली हुई है कि ये सारे कर्मचारी हटा दिये जायेंगे। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार का इरादा सचमुच पूरे देश में इन युनिटों में जो कर्मचारी काम करते हैं, उनकी छटनी करने का है?

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: I would like to share this information with the House. In 244 PSUs we have 23 lakh employees. We have 98 totally loss making units. There are 50 sick units, as I have already stated. And the total number of workers employed in the sick units is 4,07,781. We are concerned about the sick units and it would be in the greter interest of the workers and these sick units should be revived. Something has to be done because the country cannot carry on with such huge losses. It is for this reason that we have come out with this policy. We want to have a consensus on this. The Prime Minister has made it very clear that he wanted a consensus on this issue and hence he wanted to have a discussion on this matter. The Government would stand to gain by such a discussion as it would be benefited by the suggestions that would be made by the hon. Members... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: His question was as to how many workers would be affected. The Minister is not saying that.... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: We can have a full-scale discussion and we can benefit by their suggestions. This is a national problem and we will have to find a solution .... (*Interruptions*)..

श्री राम नरेश यादव : मान्यवर, मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं आया है। मैं यह जानना चाहता था कि यह सचमच में बहुत महत्वपूर्ण और राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है, लेकिन उसके आधार पर छंटनी होने की संभावना है या नहीं और अगर छंटनी होगी तो सरकार क्या कदम उठाने जा रही है? यही मेरा प्रश्न था क्योंकि यही भ्रम फैला हुआ है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is asking whether employees would be retrenched. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: Sir, that is why I have been repeating that the policy is to refer to the BIFR....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is going to be a full-scale discussion on it and I think we should move on to the next question ... *(Interruptions)*... The Government is willing to have a full-scale discussion ... *(Interruptions)*... Please listen to me. I have not permitted you. Nothing will go on record... *(Interruptions)*...There are so many people and so many questions; I can only permit a few. The Government is offering a full-scale discussion and we can dscuss these issues then...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Meanwhile the Bill will be passed...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thungon, will you discuss it in tis session?...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P. K. THUNGON: Yes, Sir, in this session...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: As Mr. Desai has pointed out, the Government as brought forward a legislation to amend the BIFR *(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 103

Preference to SNAM Progetti Fertilizer Plant

*103. SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA:†
SHRI SARADA MOHANTY:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the cost of Snam Progetti Fertilizer Plant was Rs. 700 crores, while Kellogg fertilizer plant of the same capacity was available at Rs. 400 crores;

(b) whether it is also a fact that Snam Progetti and Kellogg plants have big variations in regard to consumption of gas and electricity; and

(c) if so, the reasons for giving preference to Snam Progetti Plant?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

(a) No, Sir. The relevant details of cost of plants of comparable vintage and size using these two technologies are given below:

Statement

Name of the Company	Location	Technology used	Annual prodn. capacity in terms of 'N' (000MT)	Year of commissioning	Capital cost	
					Approved cost	Completed cost
					(Rs. in crores)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilisers Limited	Thal	Haldor Topsoe for Ammonia & Snam progetti for Urea	683	1985	919·00	980·00
2. Krishak Bharati Coop, Ltd,	Hazira	Kellogg for Ammonia and Snam progetti for Urea	668	1986	957·00	890·00

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Chimanbhai Mehta.